

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,392	09/23/2003	Thomas Rostrup-Nielsen	H0610.0348/P348	9374
24998	7590 11/21/2005		EXAM	INER
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN & OSHINSKY LLP			LANGEL, WAYNE A	
2101 L Street, Washington,	•		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1754	-
			DATE MAILED: 11/21/200	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			H
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	~~
	10/667,392	ROSTRUP-NIELSEN ET	ΓAL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Wayne Langel	1754	
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFI after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the m earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUN R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may nod will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mi atute, cause the application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this communication ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _			
	——.· Гhis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allo		atters, prosecution as to the meri	its is
closed in accordance with the practice und	•	•	
Disposition of Claims	-		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-12</u> is/are pending in the applicat	tion		
4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>9-12</u> is/are withdr			
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 6-8</u> is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>7</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) 1-12 are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner		
<u> </u>	accepted or b) objected t	o by the Examiner	
Applicant may not request that any objection to	. ,— ,	•	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor		• •	21(d)
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore	eign priority under 35 U.S.C.	. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	- •		
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.		
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		Application No	
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p			e
application from the International Bur		v	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies no	ot received.	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	v Summary (PTO-413)	
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☑ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB Paper No(s)/Mail Date 8 25 ~ 4 and 9 ~ 14 ~ 04	√08) 5) ☐ Notice o	o(s)/Mail Date f Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-8, drawn to a process for preparing synthesis gas, classified in class 252, subclass 373.

II. Claims 9-12, drawn to an apparatus for preparing synthesis gas, classified in class 422, subclass 211.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus, such as one which does not include an adiabatic pre-reformer.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, and vice versa, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Application/Control Number: 10/667,392 Page 3

Art Unit: 1754

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Soffen on October 24, 2005 a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-8. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 9-12 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "high surface" is relative and therefor indefinite.

The specification is objected to as being inconsistent with the Drawings and misleading. For example, the specification states on page 14, lines 26 and 27 that the desired reformed product [8] is collected from the reforming tubes, whereas it would appear that the desired reformed product is collected from the reforming tubes at [6]. Also, "steam" apparently should read -- stream -- at various locations in the specification (for example, page 14, line 24 and page 6, line 8).

Art Unit: 1754

The Drawings are objected to as being incomplete, in that Fig. 2 fails to depict catalysts [22a], [24a] and [26a].

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Bogart (US 3,743,488) discloses a process for generating high pressure synthesis gas form a hydrocarbon-steam mixture by contacting the reaction mixture at reaction temperature with a solid catalyst for the endothermic synthesis gas generating reaction, the steps including, in sequence, (1) heating the reaction mixture in a heating zone out of contact with the catalyst to reaction temperature, (2) adiabatically reacting the heated reaction mixture in a reaction zone containing the catalyst and separate from the heating zone to form a synthesis gas-containing effluent, and repeating steps (1) and (2) until the hydrocarbon vapor is substantially exhausted. Grotz et al (US 4,959,079) disclose a process for producing synthesis gas wherein the heat from the hot flue gas from the fired steam reformer is utilized. Although it is conventional to prereform a steam-methane mixture in an adiabatic reformer reactor and then further process the pre-reformed product in a fluid tubular reformer (see col. 2, lines 4-14 of Nataraj et al (US 6,110,979)), this would not provide motivation to further process the synthesis gas formed in the process of Bogart in a fired steam reformer and to utilize the heat from the fired steam reformer to heat the reaction mixture of steam and hydrocarbon, since there is no indication in Bogart that the synthesis gas should be further processed, and there is nothing in Grotz et al to suggest that the heat from the hot flue gas from the fired steam reformer should be utilized to heat the reaction mixture which could then be adiabatically reformed outside of the waste heat section.

Art Unit: 1754

Claims 1-4 and 6-8 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne Langel whose telephone number is 571-272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays to Fridays from 8 to 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman, can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wayne Langel Primary Examiner Art Unit 1754